

**TEXT LIGHT
WITHIN THE BOOK
ONLY**

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_214969

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 922/14 711 Ab. Accession No. 6999

Author Abus Salam Khan

Title Greatest Man 1922

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

THE GREATEST MAN

BY

Abdus Salam Khan

OF SEONI. C. P.

ASSISTANT MASTER IN ANJUMAN HIGH SCHOOL,
NAGPUR. (INDIA)

All Rights Reserved

Printed at the Anjuman Press Nagpur.

DEDICATED
TO
MUHAMMAD,
THE ARABIAN PROPHÉT
(PEACE AND MERCY OF GOD BE UPON HIM)
AS
A MARK OF HUMBLE DEVOTION AND GRATITUDE.]

INTRODUCTION.

IN this little book, I have proved, in as few words as I could, the superiority of Muhammad, the Arabian Prophet and lawgiver, over all other men Humanity has ever produced.

I have been content with stating facts only—facts which History has preserved most carefully to this day.

To corroborate myself, I have, wherever necessary, quoted eminent Christian writers, among whom will be found George Sale, Sir William Muir, T. Carlyle, Gibbon, C. Taylor, Johnson, Deutsch, Davenport, Prof. Montete, Barthelémy St. Hilairi, S. Lane-poole, Bosworth Smith and Major Leonard. I am much indebted to all these authors for their valuable opinions. Without their help, the task would, indeed, have been too difficult for me.

Thinking that the opinions of the Muhammadan writers may not be considered valid by some of the non-Muslim readers, I have avoided them all with the exception of Mr. Syed Ameer Ali, to whom I am highly indebted for the valuable quotations from his 'Spirit of Islam'.

Inasmuch as I am a young man of not more than twenty years, I claim some measure of indulgence for any shortcomings or errors that may be found in this little book.

ANJUMAN HOSTEL,
NAGPUR:
The 15th. June 1922. }

A. S. KHAN.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Test of Greatness.	1
Muhammad as a King.	5
Muhammad as a Conqueror.	9
Muhammad as a Legislator and an Administrator.	10
Muhammad as a Thinker and a Philosopher.	22
Muhammad as a Reformer and a Nation-builder.	25
Muhammad as a Saint, a Sage and a Prophet.	30
Muhammad as an Honest and a Faithful man.	46
Muhammad's Biography.	48
Muhammad's Mark on History.	51
Appendix	53
A Call to Truth.	56
Errata.	59

IN THE NAME OF GOD, THE MERCIFUL, THE
COMPASSIONATE.

THE GREATEST MAN.

FROM the very beginning of the world, Humanity has produced men who have won for themselves, from their countrymen and the people of the world at large, the time-honoured title of 'The Great'; and from time immemorial conferences and meetings of men of culture and curiosity have been called to ascertain as to who could be the greatest man, Humanity has ever produced.

This has been from time immemorial the favourite topic of all nations of all ages. It has often attracted the attention and engrossed the energies of men of much curiosity and erudition, so much so that whenever these men have met together, they have seldom departed without an interesting discussion on this topic.

It is curiously interesting to go through and examine the various decisions and the various proclamation of various ages and sundry nations. But as men are born with different choices, they have seldom given a decision, which the people of other nations or the majority of them could accept.

Various people of various ages have set forth, for their ideal and standard, a different virtue, have tried men according to it, and have given out

their decision in favour of the man who, according to their knowledge, possessed it in the highest degree. In this respect they all seem to be equally mistaken; for they have based their tests very often on one, single virtue—apart from all others.

They have at times even failed to ascertain as to which could be the greatest virtue, that could exalt a man to the topmost mark of elevation.

According to their choices, some have set forth, for their standard and ideal, royalty, some statesmanship, and others piety and truth. Consequently the result of their discussions has been sometimes a king or conqueror, sometimes an administrator or legislator, sometimes a thinker or philosopher, sometimes a nation-builder or moral reformer, and sometimes a holy saint or sage.

Almost all of them seem to have taken into consideration one and only one aspect of the life of the man, upon whom they have bestowed this title. For example when they have pronounced a king to be the greatest of all men of the time, they have taken into account only one aspect of his life, *viz.*, his life as a king, regardless of all other aspects—private, religious, social, and otherwise.

In such cases their decision has been condemned and thrown down by those who set forth, for their standard, high morality and spirituality. These facts are enough to lead one to believe that one and only one virtue—apart from all others, cannot make a man the greatest of all, and that men, on account of the difference of their choices, will continue to differ if it were presumed that one and only one virtue can make a man superior to all others. But I believe most of the honest and reasonable persons will agree with me, when I say that if all the virtues—greatest and highest, were

embodied in one personage, then assuredly and without the least doubt, that personage rightly deserved and still deserves this highest of titles and greatest of distinctions. He can be said, acknowledged and accepted to be the greatest man, Humanity has ever produced.

For this purpose—the purpose of bestowing this title, and with this object in view, we should single out a man in whom we can find a king and conqueror, an administrator and legislator, a philosopher and thinker, a religious preacher and a national reformer, a high priest and a holy saint, and a conscientious, truthful and virtuous man; *i. e.*, in short, a moral, spiritual and material builder.

He must have been a king whose hold was not ephemeral, nor even arbitrary, but a king whose empire had a wide extent and a lasting endurance, a conqueror whose conquests knew no bounds, a statesman and legislator whose laws were the most reasonable, practicable and efficient, a politician and administrator whose politics and policies had no evil bearings or artful diplomacies, a wise and just ruler, a military general who could command a large army and who never lost the field; a soldier who knew no despair or despondency and who suffered no defeat, a reformer, who influenced not only a single community or a age, but humanity itself and for all ages, a moral preacher who exalted mankind from a pitch of moral degradation to a plat-form of sublime elevation, a nation-builder, whose nation consisted not of a single people but of all humanity, a prophet who gave and continues to give light and truth to all men of all ages and of all countries, a philosopher whose theories were the soundest and the most reasonable, a saint and a sage whose holiness knew no stain, and a man who was ever true to himself, to his fellow-beings

and above all to his God. Such is our ideal at the outset, and such is the test we have fixed.

Now let us endeavour to see and find out whether at any time there lived, on the surface of the earth, a man, who could be and really was the embodiment of all we have just said, and who fulfilled the conditions, we have imposed.

The man, who, today first and foremost of all, attracts our attention, is Muhammad, the Arabian law-giver and Prophet.

I would fain have gone through details—the minutest details of his life, from his birth to his death; but lest the interest of the reader be lost through a long and therefore tedious discussion, I would better leave them as they are, and beg the patience of the curious reader, who desires to testify and enquire into the truth of what I say, to consult the Biographies of this man—Biographies written by eminent and un-prejudiced writers, who have dealt with him honestly and faithfully.

I would, therefore, on this occasion only try to answer the WHY? leaving the HOW? to be answered by the reader himself after the manner, I have pointed out.

To return to the subject, we will now mould our topic of discussion in the following manner. We shall take up all the virtues, one by one, and see as-to how far, and to what degree they are to be found in the man, we have singled out.

For this purpose, we would divide the subject-matter into seven question-heads, as we may call them; and try to answer them briefly with the actions and life of this noble man before us.

1.—WAS MUHAMMAD SUPERIOR TO ALL OTHER KINGS?

THE superiority and greatness of a king lie neither in his heritage of a mighty and well-established empire, nor in his conquests made with the help of countless hosts of well-trained soldiers; but they lie in his self-endeavour, in his skill and ability, and in his personal courage and resourcefulness. The smaller his means and resources at the outset, the greater his merits and superiority. In Muhammad's case his resources were the smallest and his achievements the greatest and the most enduring. In spite of his single-handedness and helplessness at the out-set, he succeeded in establishing an empire, which once had the widest extent and which exists until today, thirteen hundred and forty years after him.

Speaking of him Major Leonard, the author of "Islam, Her Moral And Spiritual Value," remarks, "Seldom, indeed, in the history of the world, has so great a human river flowed from a source so puny." And referring to his rapid conquests and his means at the outset, Stobart says, "Judged by the smallness of the means at his disposal, and the extent and perseverance of the work, he accomplished, no name in the world's History shines with a more specious lustre than that of the Prophet of Mecca.....Judged by the standard of human renown, the glory of what mortal can compare with his?"

This poor man, whom in his later years we shall find a great king and conqueror, inherited no kingdom, no troops, not even an inch of land or a single soul as a slave. He was doubly orphan, and from his very childhood was brought up under the care and supervision of his uncle, who was nothing more than the head of a family.

His greatness, as we shall see, lies in his entering the field of conquests single-handed with no troops or followers what-so-ever; and in spite of all this, in his ever-growing conquests.

There may have been kings—, mighty and great conquerors, but their power and magnificence lay in their possessions of innumerable hosts of soldiers and in their heritage of mighty and well-founded empires. But with Muhammad the case was not so. He had to build his empire from its very foundation, to establish and to consolidate it; and, moreover, he had to do all this single-handed with none but the Almighty at his back, as he always used to say.

His most reasonable, rational, and therefore appealing teachings and arguments—deadly against the belief of the fierce and turbulent Arabs among whom he was born, gained for him a few proselytes, shortly after his appearance on the scene as a moral preacher and a Prophet of God. These were thenceforth all his soldiers and subjects.

But for them and for him fate had in store a great success—a success the like of which no human being on this earth ever saw. It was not long after his appearance as a moral and religious preacher, when he met the greatest and the deadliest opposition from his compatriotic country-men, who subjected him and his followers to the grossest of insults and the severest and the most horrible of persecutions, the world ever witnessed. This hostile and aggressive attitude of his fierce antagonists made defence necessary for him. But this defence was, for him, not only a protection, but also victory and conquest. By his defence he gained, got victories, made conquests, and built his empire.

To some weak minds it may appear rather doubtful and even irrational as-to how could a man

gain victories and make conquests, while he was only defending himself against his antagonists and persecutors.

Well, do not go so far as 1,300 years back, and instead of 1,300 look only 200 years back into the history of the East India Company and its outcome, the British Indian Empire of today. How could a company of peaceful peddlers and harmless traders develop into a great ruling power? What do history and historians say about this? In silent whispers and calm expressions, they all speak in one voice that the East India Company was a union of peaceful merchants organised with the object of carrying on a trade with the East; that the lawlessness and unsafe condition of India together with the aggressive attitude of some of the native princes made for it defence necessary; and that the British Indian Empire of today is the out-come of this very defence.

I believe this is enough to convince one of the possibility of conquests and victories by defence and defence only. Such, my friends, was the case with Muhammad, the Arabian conqueror. His defence led to his victories, and his helplessness to his strength.

As a ruler and judge, he was just and merciful to the highest degree. All his subjects—Christians and Jews enjoyed almost equal rights with his own followers. His attitude towards the Christians and the Jews was the most tolerating.

The charter, which he gave to the monks of the monastery of St. Catherine, near mount Sinai, and to all Christians, is a living testimony of his religious toleration and equal justice.

“By it” to quote Syed Ameer Ali, “the Prophet secured to the Christians privileges and immunities which they did not possess even under sovereigns of

their own creed; and declared that any Moslem violating and abusing what was therein ordered, should be regarded as a violator of God's testament, a transgressor of His commandments, and a slighter of His faith. He undertook himself, and enjoined on his followers, to protect the Christians, to defend their Churches, the residence of their priests and to guard them from all injuries. They were not to be unfairly taxed; no bishop was to be driven out of his bishopric, no Christian was to be forced to reject his religion; no monk was to be expelled from his monastery; no pilgrim was to be detained from his pilgrimage."

He not only proclaimed but proved by practice what equal justice and religious toleration meant. Christian rulers may proclaim religious toleration and equal justice, but do they really act according to what they say? History will answer this question better than I can.

The government of Muhammad, and his immediate successors was to use an expression of Bosworth Smith, 'the best, the simplest, and the most republican of all absolute governments.'

Muhammad, moreover, possessed a military and kingly genius which never failed him, not even in a single battle or any matter of state. And so with all his helplessness he had had the fortune to build, to establish and to consolidate an empire which once comprised the East and the West, and which exists until today 1,340 years after him. He built his empire on a very strong and sound basis—a basis which no wear and tear of time could, nor can destroy or demolish. When once he conquered, he never lost, but whatever he gained by his defence, he organised and consolidated.

Thus we see that the superiority of Muhammad over all other kings lies in his founding, establishing, and consolidating an empire, which had no

parallel in extent and endurance in the history of the world, and above all in his doing so single-handed at the outset, in a hostile country and amidst fierce and turbulent antagonists, whose persecution was the severest and most brutish.

2.—WAS MUHAMMAD SUPERIOR TO ALL OTHER CONQUERORS?

THIS question may be answered in fewer words than others. That Muhammad is the greatest of all conquerors, is an undisputed fact, which none can deny. The world can boast of no man, whose conquests were more rapid and wide-spread than those of Muhammad. In less than a century, he built up, to the great surprise of all historians, an Empire greater than the mighty empire of Rome—a growth of centuries. An idea of the long, long period, in which the empire of Rome was built up, may be gathered from the proverb, which it gave birth to—the proverb that “Rome was not built in a day.” If those long rolling centuries and the short span, in which Muhammad built up his empire, be put together side by side, we can safely assert a proverb equally true—the proverb that “Muhammad built his empire in a day.” These are mere historical facts, which require no explanation. I would, however, quote the following beautiful assertion of Carlyle, which will give an idea of the nature of conquests made by him, and with which will close the answer to the above question.

“These Arabs,” he says “the man Muhammad, and that one century—is it not as if a spark had fallen, one spark on a world of what seemed black, unnoticeable sand, but to him sand proves explosive powder, blazes heaven-high from Delhi (in the East) to Grenada (in the West).”

3.—WAS MUHAMMAD SUPERIOR TO ALL OTHER LEGISLATORS, ADMINISTRATORS AND STATESMEN?

THE success and utility of legislation lie in the practicability and rationality of the laws instituted by the legislator. No man can be said to be a great or successful legislator, if the laws and regulations made by him were impracticable, irrational, or even arbitrary. The laws, which Muhammad gave to the world are not in the least impracticable, irrational or arbitrary.

Relating to his laws, Urquhart says, "The excellence and effectiveness of each of these principles (each capable of immortalizing its founder) gave value to the rest; and all combined endowed the system, which they formed, with an energy exceeding those of any other political system. Within the life-time of a man, though in the hands of a population, wild, ignorant and insignificant, it spread over a greater extent than the dominions of Rome. While it retained its primitive character, it was irresistible."

His laws are suitable and practicable for all times; although an enlightened mind of the so-called civilized world of today may find them a bit severe.

But it must be remembered that Muhammad was born not in the twentieth century, but in one of the darkest ages—an age in which crime was rife in all its hideousness and barbarity.

Moreover, the mission of Muhammad was to make laws and regulations not only for one but all times; and to rout out evil and to stamp out crime from the surface of the earth not only for one but all ages and times. He had had the sagacity,

and foresight to see that crime, which was in the greatest swing in his time, could not be got rid of, unless and until he imposed severe punishments.

But, as Islam, the code of his laws and the religion he preached, is a religion of nature and of nature's God, his laws, when taken in the real and strict sense of the word, are the most rational and best fitted for all times and for all people.

For instance, his laws relating to inheritance and legacy need special mention here. They are most natural and reasonable. Legislator and statesman as he was, Muhammad recognised that all the members of the family—males and females, who depended for their subsistence upon the deceased, should inherit a part of his property in order that they may be able to maintain an adequate living after him. So, he gave out laws by which sons as well as daughters, and even other relations get their due shares from the property. For show and show only, nations and religions may profess respect to ladies and children; but do they really lay down, for their protection, such laws as Muhammad did?

His law* of retaliation has been, for sometime, an object of great sarcasm and ridicule for missionary preachers and European writers. But this is out of mere fanaticism and religious prejudice and bigotry; for if they had a real insight into human nature, they could never have done so.

The very sense of retaliation and spirit of revenge Providence has implanted in human nature for the protection of self and defence of honour. Had man been born void of this sense, he would

*By the laws of Muhammad, I mean the laws which Muhammad gave to the world, i.e., the laws of the Holy Quran

have been an object of insults and ridicule for his countless enemies—men and animals who could practise tyranny upon him with impunity. History will clearly show you that no men, no nations, no people, could ever live peacefully and honourably on the surface of the earth unless and until they made proper and right use of the weapon of defence, which Nature provided them for their protection.

“In the state of nature” says Gibbon, “every man has a right to defend, by force of his arms, his person, and his possessions, to repel, or even to prevent the violence of his enemies and to extend his hostilities to a reasonable measure of satisfaction and retaliation.”

A real insight as he had into human nature, Muhammad realized that if he disallowed men to make rightful use of this natural weapon of defence, he would be leading them against nature and therefore doing utter injustice to humanity. He knew that human nature can tolerate injustice and insults but to a limited extent, after which defence and protection become natural and therefore indispensable. To this extent he forcibly recommends forbearance and forgiveness, but after this he allows retaliation as natural and therefore lawful. Although he made retaliation a law, he was forgiving and forbearing to the highest degree.

“Here is a story,” says Bosworth Smith, “which illustrates the nature of the revenge which the Prophet lived to take. He was one day sleeping under a tree, alone, and at a distance from his camp, when he awoke and beheld Durthur, his deadly foe, standing over him with a drawn sword. ‘Oh, Muhammad,’ cried he, ‘who is there now to save thee?’ ‘God,’ said the Prophet. Struck with awe, Durthur dropped his sword, and exclaimed,

in his return, 'Oh Durthur, who is there now to save thee?' 'No one,' replied Durthur. 'Then learn from me to be merciful.' With these words, he gave him back his sword, and made him his firmest friend."

No man has ever been so forgiving and so forbearing as Muhammad was. Even his bitterest foes and persecutors met with the kindest treatment from him. These virtues none can deny. Even George Sale, who was one of the bitterest enemies of Muhammad, and who once dreamt of converting the whole Muslim world to Christianity by arguments, which he puts forth, for the guidance of missionary preachers, in the preface to his translation of al-Koran, and which disclose the arrogance of Christian preachers and the weakness of Christianity itself, could not but applaud the congenial virtues of Muhammad.

Bearing in mind that Sale and Spanhemius both were Christian writers, and remembering that their belief in the false copies of a Divine revelation prompted them to call Muhammad an impostor, the reader may go through the following passage, which I quote here from Sale's preface to the aforesaid translation of al-Koran. He writes, "How criminal soever Mohammed may have been in imposing a false religion on mankind, the praises due to his real virtues ought not to be denied him. Nor can I do otherwise than applaud the candour of the pious and learned Spanhemius, who, though he owned him to have been a wicked impostor, yet acknowledged him to have been richly furnished with natural endowments, beautiful in his person, of a subtle wit, agreeable behaviour, showing liberality to the poor, courtesy to every one, fortitude against his enemies and above all a high reverence for the name of God; severe against the perjured, adulterers, murderers, slanderers,

prodigals, covetous, false witnesses etc, a great preacher of patience, charity, mercy, beneficence, gratitude, honouring of parents and superiors, and a frequent celebrator of the Divine praises."

It is worth remarking that in spite of these virtues, Muhammad was yet a mad man in the estimation of George Sale. Has any other mad man or even man possessed all these virtues combined? Oh, how bigoted and foolish these Christian biographers of Muhammad are! Their fanaticism has almost deprived them of their faculty of reasoning.

Jehad, Muhammad's law of war, has likewise been an object of terrific fear even to the diplomatic politicians of the non-moslem world. But like all other charges it, too, is founded on weak grounds and misconception. Jehad means nothing but fighting in the way of God for the protection of His religion, in defence of self and for the benefit of mankind.

I would begin the explanation of jehad with a quotation from Bosworth Smith's 'Mohammed and Mohammedanism'. He writes, "It is true, of course, that a holy war waged by Christians is in direct contravention of the spirit of their Founder, while one waged by Mohammedans is in accordance with both the practice and the precept of the Prophet "

The following illustration will give the reader an idea of what the practice and the precept of the Prophet are in this respect.

Now there are two patients who have been attacked by an epidemic disease. Each of them is placed under the care and treatment of a physician. Having tried all medicines and cures, the physicians come to the conclusion that poison is the only medicine which can, under these circum-

stances, save their patients. Both of them are well aware of the fact that poison, though fatal and mortalising under ordinary circumstances, is yet the only cure under the present ones. So far the physicians agree with each other; but as to the course to be adopted to cure their patients, they begin to differ. One of them proposes to administer a drug of poison to his patient, while the other forbids in forcible terms the use of poison for his patient, saying that although poison may prove efficacious under such circumstances, yet poison is poison and should be avoided on all accounts.

Having arrived at these conclusions, the former prescribes a drug of poison, and administers it to his patient; but the latter, still arguing that poison is poison and should, on no account, be tasted, leaves his patient either to die in despair or to administer the drug himself.

What then is the result? The patient, under the treatment of the former, recovers as soon as the drug is administered to him according to the prescription of his physician; but the patient under the treatment of the latter either expires in despair, or going contrary to the advice of his physician administers the poison himself, and having no prescription of his physician, overadministers the drug which naturally proves more fatal.

The two physicians in the above illustration, are Muhammad and Christ; and their patients, the people whom they guide.

Both of them agree to the fact that war and blood-shed are fatal and destructive under ordinary circumstances, and should be avoided; but Muhammad gives, under extraordinary circumstances, a wise concession to his followers to administer, according to his prescription, the

poisonous drug of war, when there is no other hope of recovery and when their very existence is threatened or endangered—a time when poison is not poison, but medicine and cure. But Christ would, on no account, grant any concession to his followers. He leaves them either to die a hopeless death or to overadminister the drug.

What the results of such injunctions have been Smith has already remarked. Jihad, in accordance with the prescription of the Prophet, in the case of Muhammadans; and crusades, in contravention of the spirit of Christ, in the case of Christians, who have, in despair and on account of having no prescription of their Founder, often overadministered the drug?

As to the efficacy of the prescription of Muhammad and the nature of jihad, I would, after informing the reader that B. Smith has tried to point out a contrast between jihad and the crusades, quote the following assertion of his. "The Mohammedan wars", he says, "were never internecine." It then follows that the crusades, were internecine, and as history itself reveals very brutish. Is it not the effect of over-administration of the poisonous drug?

Such then is the contrast between the teachings, precepts and laws of Muhammad and Christ.

The laws of Muhammad are quite in keeping with the nature of man and the circumstances forced on him, while those of Christ are quite contrary to all that is natural. The Muhammadans always have before them the example of their Prophet, *"A QUENCHED YET BURNING FLAME"*; and are guided by him under all circumstances; while Christians have no guide for them in the time of calamity, and are obliged either to give

way to despair or to do what Christ forbade them to do. Muhammad guides his followers on the path of light, reason and truth; while Christianity leaves them wandering in mysteries, and groping in darkness to find out a guide, which they can never find in Christ, but if by good luck they do, they find in Muhammad.

As man is a production of nature, and is, moreover, governed by the laws of nature, the religion which suits him most perfectly is not Christianity, but Islam. His true guide is Muhammad, not Christ.

Now to return to the subject, the Holy Koran, the code of laws which Muhammad gave to the world is the most perfect of all codes and touches all heads of legislation—civil, judicial, military and otherwise.

“The Koran,” to quote Davenport, “is the general code of the Moslem world; social, civil, commercial, military, judicial, criminal, penal, and yet religious code: by it everything is regulated, from ceremonies of religion to those of daily-life; from salvation of the soul to the health of the body; from the rights of the general community to those of society, from morality to crime, from punishment here to that of the life to come.”

The world can produce no other code of laws, which may be more perfect than the Holy Koran.

Moreover, there might have been legislators—great and wise, but they depended for their laws on book-knowledge and other sorts of similar training; but with Muhammad the case was not so, illiterate as he was.

To sum up, the Superiority of Muhammad

over all other legislators lies in his giving to the world the most practicable and efficient code of laws, which touches, all aspects of life—political, social, religious, communal, and otherwise, and all heads of legislation—civil, criminal, military and judicial; and the more it lies in his being unlike all others a self-taught man, and a thinker and worker not only for his own, but all ages.

Legislation aims at the institution and framing of laws, while administration aims at enforcing them on those for whom they are made. Just as the success of legislation lies in the practicability of laws, so does the success of administration lie in enforcing them properly, and ultimately stamping out crime, maintaining peace and order, and bringing about the contentment and the happiness of the subjects.

The results of a good and wise administration are the happiness and contentment of those over whom the administration enforces the laws, and the peace and prosperity of the kingdom. The better the administration, the greater the happiness and prosperity of the subjects, and the more the love and devotion of the subjects for the administrator.

The administration of Muhammad satisfies all such conditions. In stamping out crime, in checking the tide of immorality, and in establishing peace and order, he gained almost an unparalleled success—so much so that it is said of him that *'he turned a moral desert into a beautiful garden.'*

There can be, in fact, no contentment and no prosperity that can surpass those of the subjects of Muhammad. Under him they progressed in leaps and bounds. No administrator has ever succeeded in gaining, from his subjects,

so much love and sympathy as Muhammad did. They loved and still love him with heart and soul. They sacrificed and still continue to sacrifice, for him and for his God, everything in their possession—life and property.

As a humble instance of the love and attachment of Muhammad's followers to him, I may quote the following assertion of Muir. "Muhammad was," he says, "the minister of life to them, the source under God of their new-born hopes, and to him they yielded an implicit submission. . . . The Believers bore persecution with a patient and tolerant spirit, and though it was their wisdom so to do, the credit of magnanimous forbearance may be freely accorded. One hundred men and women, rather than abjure their precious faith, had abandoned their homes and sought refuge, till the storm should be passed over, in Abyssinian exile, and now a still larger number, with their Prophet himself, were emigrating from their fondly loved city with its sacred temple, to them the holiest spot on earth, and fleeing to Medina. There the same marvellous charm had within two or three years been preparing a brother-hood ready to defend the Prophet and his followers with their blood."

The sympathies of the administrator may overcome the antipathies of the subjects, but the administrator cannot force the subjects to love and sympathise with him. The subjects of Muhammad—, apart from any force whatsoever, loved and still love him better than any people or nation ever loved their administrator.

"If the warmth of his attachment," says Bosworth Smith, "may be measured, as in fact it may, by the depth of his friends' devotion to him, no truer friend than Mohammed ever lived."

And again he says, " Head of the State as well as of the Church, he was Cæsar and Pope in one; but he was Pope without the Pope's pretensions, and Cæsar without the legions of Cæsar. Without a standing army, without a body-guard, without a palace, without a fixed revenue, if ever any man had the right to say that he ruled by a right Divine, it was Mohammed; for he had all the power without its instruments and without its supports."

Thus, in the sincere attachment of his followers to him, in his turning a moral desert into a garden, in his success in maintaining law and order among wild and lawless people, and in his gaining the best love and sympathy from his subjects, lies the superiority of Muhammad over all other administrators.

He was, in fact, a great politician and statesman; for his politics never failed, and his policies never proved false, treacherous or destructive. He had a great genius in devising policies, for he had had an insight into the real state of things. No man can be said to be a great statesman or a skilful politician, if he fails in studying and realizing the real state of affairs, and ultimately adopting suitable and effective policies. Policies, suitable policies can only be devised, adopted and changed, when the situation has been studied thoroughly; and the skill of the politician lies in his grasping the true and real aspect of things, in going deep into their nature, and adopting effective and constructive policies.

No man could study the nature of man or his situation on the earth's surface, or ascertain as to which policy could be most suitable to him, better than Muhammad did. His knowledge of what man is and of what he needs, was the most

authentic and upto date; and ultimately the policies, he adopted, were the best possible and the best suited not only to his, but all times.

With a keen insight into man, his nature, and his needs, he realized, and recognized that man was equally a religious and political factor of God's creation. With this recognition, he succeeded in devising and adopting policies, which were the most practicable, effective, and constructive.

He recognized that no policies and no politics could be of any avail, unless and until he united materialism with spiritualism; and this is a fact, which no other politician has ever been able to realize and penetrate into.

He recognized that to maintain perfect peace and order, fear of God is as essential as the fear of punishment by the administration.

Speaking of him Major Leonard remarks, "The political and economic factor were as much a radical part of his entire design as the religious. The one could not exist without the other. Statesman as he was, he recognized that religious unity could only be maintained through political cooperation, and that to secure national stability the sinews of war were essential."

His skill as an economist was as great as a politician. His economical theories were based neither on arbitrary customs nor on exorbitant taxes; but a keen insight as he had into human nature, he based his economical theories on universal charity, brotherly love, and free trade.

So Major Leonard again observes, "Not only was he a preacher and Prophet; not only was he a law-giver— a law and light to his people to

this day, but as one who himself rigidly practised self-denial and economy, and condemned extravagance, who possessed the organizing ability to administer the state of others, who could command preferably in peace, but if necessary in war; he was a statesman and economist."

To conclude, the superiority of Muhammad over all other politicians and statesmen lies in his authentic study and true knowledge of the nature of man and of all he needs, in his recognition of man as both a religious and political creature, in his wise policy of uniting materialism with spiritualism, in his various other policies, which were altogether free from treacherous diplomacie and evil bearings, and in his economical theories, which were based on universal charity and love, and which were void of all forcible taxation.

4.—WAS MUHAMMAD SUPERIOR TO ALL OTHER THINKERS AND PHILOSOPHERS?

THE skill and genius of the philosopher lie in his right thinking, in his accuracy of observation, in his keen perception, in the truth and soundness of his theories, and in the correctness of his conclusions.

The perception and the observation of Muhammad were the most accurate, thorough and penetrating; and his theories were the soundest and the most rational.

The results of his speculations were most certain and accurate. He was in fact a great and serious thinker.

The Holy Koran, the book he gave to the world is the greatest of all philosophical evolutions. In spite of this long period of thirteen centuries and

more, no philosopher, no thinker; no man could ever disprove even one of his theories, falsify his observations, or deny his conclusions; while theories of philosophers—eminent and great, have been disputed, condemned, and thrown down.

His study and perception of man and human nature are most accurate and authentic. His theories of the creation of man and the world, their ends and the future existence, no philosopher until today could prove to be false.

Those who want to have a psychological insight into his theories, may go direct to the Koran, and if possible to its various commentaries, written by Muhammadan doctors.

All the precepts, which he preached, have a philosophical basis. For these and their psychology, I would beg the patience of those, who are interested in philosophy to refer to and consult the works of Syed Ameer Ali, Dr Iqbal, and if possible of Imam Al-Ghazali.

Besides all I have said till now, what elevates him over all others is the fact he was, as Major Leonard has remarked, 'not only a thinking philosopher, but also a working philosopher.' Whatever he said, he proved practically. He did not leave his theories to be proved or disproved by others; he worked them out himself.

But what elevates him still more is, to use the words of a Christian writer, the fact that 'he was a thinker and worker not only for his own, but all times.'

He was, moreover, unlike all other philosophers, who derived their knowledge from books or borrowed from others, a self-taught man. He

derived his knowledge from profound thought, deep concentration of mind, and inspiration.

The following remark of Carlyle will give the reader an idea of his profound thought and deep concentration of mind,

"A silent great soul," says Carlyle, "he was one of those, who cannot but be in earnest, whom nature herself has appointed to be sincere. While others walk in formulas and hearsays, contented enough to dwell therein, this man could not screen himself in formulas, he was alone with his whole soul and the reality of things. The great mystery of existence glared in upon him with its terrors, and its splendours; no hearsays could hide that unspeakable fact: 'here am I.' Such sincerity, as we named it, has in truth something of the Divine. The word of such a man is a voice direct from nature's own heart. Men do and must listen to that or to nothing else; all else is wind in comparison. From of old a thousand thoughts in his pilgrimage and wanderings had been in this man. 'What am I?' What is this unfathomable thing, I live in, which men name universe? What is life? What is death? What am I to believe? What am I to do?' The grim rocks of Mount Hira, of Mount Sinai, the stern, sandy solitude answered not. The great heaven, rolling silently overhead with its bright glancing stars answered not. There was no answer. The man's own soul and what of God's inspiration dwelt there had to answer."

As to his being a thinker, Leonard says, "If ever man opened his heart to the Father and Mother of all things, this Muhammad, the merchant, did."

So to close the answer to the above question, the superiority of Muhammad over all other

thinkers and philosophers lies in the keenness and accuracy of his observations and perceptions, in the truth and soundness of his theories, in his being a thinking as well as a working philosopher, in his being a self-taught man, and above all in his being a philosopher not only for his own, but all times.

5.—WAS MUHAMMAD SUPERIOR TO ALL OTHER REFORMERS AND NATION-BUILDERS?

The merits of reformation lie in the degree of eminence to which the reformer elevates those whom he reforms, and in the width and extent of the sphere which he influences. The higher the eminence and the wider the sphere, the greater the merits. Muhammad stands a-head of all reformers in both the respect and both the ways. On the one hand, he elevated humanity from the lowest pitch of moral degradation to the topmost pinnacle of morality; and on the other, he influenced the greatest and the widest sphere—Humanity itself.

He was, 'in fact, as Bosworth Smith has remarked, 'the greatest of all reformers.'

Arabia, his native land, was, in his early days, in the state of lowest moral degradation, and a scene of devastating horror. Crime was rife in all its dreadful and abominable incarnations. There was no law, and therefore no fear of punishment. Crimes were committed with impunity. Infanticide, suicide, homicide, concubinage, slavery, disaffection, animosity, antipathy, atheism, polytheism, and all sorts of abominable practices were in full swing.

"Such then," to use the words of Bosworth Smith, "very briefly, was the condition of the Arabs, social and religious, when to use an expression of Voltaire, quoted by Barthelemy St Hilaire, 'the turn of Arabia' came; when the hour had already struck for the most complete, the most sudden, and the most extraordinary revolution, that has ever come over any nation upon the earth."

His rational arguments and appealing teachings had had a magical effect in turning these devastating scenes of horror into a flourishing garden and a prospering commonwealth.

Carlyle thus describes the revolution, brought about by the Arabian Prophet. "To the Arab nation," he says, "it was a birth from darkness into light. Arabia first became alive by means of it. A poor shepherd people roaming unnoticed in its deserts, since the creation of the world; a Hero—Prophet was sent down to them with a word they could believe. See, the unnoticed becomes world-noticeable, the small has grown world-wide; within one century afterwards, Arabia is at Grenada on this hand, at Delhi on that; glancing in valour and splendour and the light of genius, Arabia shines through long ages over a great section of of the world. Belief is great, life-living. The history of a nation becomes fruitful, soul-elevating, great, so soon as it believes. These Arabs, the man Muhammad, and that one century, is it not as if a spark had fallen, one spark on a world of what seemed black, un-noticeable sand? But to him sand proves explosive powder, blazes heaven-high from Delhi to Grenada."

Muir's testimony is, inasmuch as it comes from a hostile pen, also worthy of mention here.

The whole description is bold and encouraging; but, for the sake of brevity, I quote a few words only.

"Thirteen centuries before the Hijra," says he, "Mecca lay lifeless in this debased state. What change had those thirteen years produced! A band of several hundred persons had rejected idolatry, adopted the worship of one God, and surrendered themselves implicitly to the guidance of what they believed as a revelation from Him, praying to the Almighty with frequency and fervor, looking for pardon to His mercy and striving to follow after good works, almsgiving, chastity and justice."

The savage and fierce Arabs were reformed, moralized, civilized, united, changed to a peaceful, humane, and God-fearing people, and drawn close together in a compact brother-hood.

Their blood-thirstiness was substituted by their spiritual aspirations and moral ambitions.

Thus the Arabian Reformer had the fortune to see, in his own life-time, the fruits of his never-ending efforts in the cause of uplifting Humanity to the topmost mark of moral elevation.

He lived to see the fierce and dissentious Arabs turned into the most humane and God-fearing people, and united into a universal brother-hood.

"He," to use the words of Bosworth Smith, "softened the savage breast, and elevated the savage mind, and taught them what, but for him, they had never learned at all."

The essence of his teachings is Moral ethics. All his precepts teach morals. He proclaimed in plain and unmistakable terms the unity of God; the preciousness of virtue, righteousness, truth, honesty, simplicity, friendliness, kindness, courtesy, justice, fraternity, equality, and liberty.

"That part of Islam," says Chamber's Encyclopædia, "which distinctly reveals the mind of its Author, is also its most complete and its most shining part—we mean the ethics of the Koran. They are not found, any more than other laws, brought together in one or two or three Surats, but like golden threads, they are woven into the huge fabric of the religious constitution of Muhammad. Justice, falsehood, pride, revengefulness, calumny, mockery, avarice, prodigality, debauchery, mistrust, and suspicion are inveighed against as ungodly and wicked, while benevolence, liberty, modesty, forbearance, patience, endurance, frugality, sincerity, straightforwardness, decency, love of peace, and truth, and above all, trust in one God and submitting to His will, are considered as the pillars of true piety and the principal signs of a true believer."

His reformatory touches reached not only his own, but all nations, all people, all ages and all the countries of the world and not only one, but all aspects of life—social, religious, political, domestic and otherwise.

To compare the morality of his precepts with those of other reformers and religions, I quote a Christian writer.

"Let us remember," says, Cannon Taylor "that in some respects the Muslim morality is better than our own. In resignation to God's will, in temperance, charity, veracity, and in

the brotherhood of believers, they set us a pattern, we should do well to follow. Islam has abolished drunkenness, gambling and prostitution, the three curses of Christian lands."

And again, bearing in mind that it proceeds from the pen of a Christian writer, the reader may go through the following remark of Barthelémy St. Hilairi.

He writes—"With the exception of Christianity, founded on the old Testament and the Gospels with all their marvellous consequences, the world can boast of no religion that may properly be compared with Islam, or that merits even a remote comparison with it."

The stability of nation lies in the strength and firmness of the ties, with which the individual factors of the nation are bound together. There can be no ties and bonds stronger than those with which Muhammad bound together his nation. His ties are the surest and the strongest bonds of brotherly feeling and love.

The nation, he built up, is regardless of all distinctions of colour, race, or country the nation of humanity itself. In his fold the Arabs, the Egyptians, the Indians, and the English occupy equal positions. They are all, without any distinction of superiority, brethren unto one another.

He emphasized national unity in all matters—religious, temporal, and social.

"And above all things," says Leonard, "this statesman prophet was the essence and personification of centralization and concord; for unity alone rendered Islam feasible."

And again he says, "Mohammed, as I have more than once said, was all for unity and cohesion. and therefore against division and disintegration of any kind."

All his institutions and precepts tend to cohesion and concord. The institutions of *Namaz* (prayer), *Zakat* (alms-giving), and *Haj* (pilgrimage to Mecca) aim at religious and national unity. The belief in one God is the central point which acts like a huge magnetic force to keep intact the element factors of his nation. The whole nation is tied fast to this central knot by the strong ties of Faith and brotherly love.

"The Prophet of Arabia," says Bosworth Smith, "by teaching them (the Muhammadans) to worship the one true God, has given a bond of union stronger than any tie of blood or nation."

Today the nation, he built up, includes nearly 22% of the whole population of the world, and contains men of all countries, colours, and nations.

Thus the superiority of Muhammad over all other reformers and nation-builders lies in his most rational and moral precepts, in his exalting mankind from the depths of ignorance and degradation to the highest attainable mark of elevation, and above all in his influencing the wide sphere of Humanity—the mother of all nations and generations.

6.— WAS MUHAMMAD SUPERIOR TO ALL OTHER SAINTS, SAGES, AND PROPHETS?

The greatness of the saint or the sage lies in

the holiness of his life, in his religious zeal, in the sacredness of his purpose, and above all in his true and sincere devotion to God.

Muhammad was all love, devotion, and sincerity. His devotion to God was the most sincere, and his purpose the most sacred *viz*; uplifting mankind to a high moral platform and to reconcile man to his Lord.

Speaking of him Major Leonard remarks, "If ever man on this earth found God, if ever man devoted his life to God's service with a good and great motive, it is certain that the prophet of Arabia was that man."

On another occasion, he writes, "He was one of the most profoundly sincere and earnest spirits of any age or epoch—a man not only great but one of the greatest, *i.e.* truest—men humanity has ever produced. Great *i.e.* not simply as a prophet but as a patriot and statesman; a material as well as a spiritual builder, who constructed a great nation, a great empire and a still greater faith. . . . He was true—true moreover because he was true to himself, to his people, and above all to his God."

Further on he writes, "A more devout man than Muhammad never lived. He was as pre-eminently wise as he was devout."

As to his purity, he says, "From the point of physical and moral purity Muhammad was in every sense an Essene."

His life is a clean, spotless and stainless sheet of piety, purity, holiness and truth.

new moral life; all had departed from this world with their aspirations unfulfilled, their bright visions unrealized, or bequeathed the task of elevating their fellow men to sanguinary disciples or monarch pupils. (*A Joshua among the Israelites; an Ashoka among the Buddhists; a Darius among the Zoroastrians; a Constantine among the Christians.*)

It was reserved for Muhammad to fulfill his mission, and that of his predecessors. It was reserved for him alone to see the work of ameliorations—no royal disciple came with edicts to enforce the new teachings.”

There can be no doubt about the fact that Muhammad's precepts are the best, the most moral, rational, practicable, and the most effective in reconciling man to his Lord.

The cardinal belief and dogma, he parached so enthusiastically and so disinterestedly, are the unity of God and the equality of men in His sight.

“His centre of gravity,” writes Leonard, “was God. This gravity formed his character, gave him courage and endurance in all his trials and afflictions, counselled and guided him in his ordinary vocations. It was this gravity and concentration that commanded the respect and trust of all those who knew him, and came under his magnetic influence.”

To show the morality of his precepts, I would state here, as an example, one out of several *i.e.* the prayer. The going to prayer five times a day, the very insistence on the remembrance of God, is the best of all means of uplifting man from a low plain of life high up to the moral and spiritual realms and reconciling him, ultimately, to his God.

new moral life; all had departed from this world with their aspirations unfulfilled, their bright visions unrealized, or bequeathed the task of elevating their fellow men to sanguinary disciples or monarch pupils. (*A Joshua among the Israelites; an Ashoka among the Buddhists; a Darius among the Zoroastrians; a Constantine among the Christians.*)

It was reserved for Muhammad to fulfill his mission, and that of his predecessors. It was reserved for him alone to see the work of ameliorations—no royal disciple came with edicts to enforce the new teachings.”

There can be no doubt about the fact that Muhammad's precepts are the best, the most moral, rational, practicable, and the most effective in reconciling man to his Lord.

The cardinal belief and dogma, he parached so enthusiastically and so disinterestedly, are the unity of God and the equality of men in His sight.

“His centre of gravity,” writes Leonard, “was God. This gravity formed his character, gave him courage and endurance in all his trials and afflictions, counselled and guided him in his ordinary vocations. It was this gravity and concentration that commanded the respect and trust of all those who knew him, and came under his magnetic influence.”

To show the morality of his precepts, I would state here, as an example, one out of several *i.e.* the prayer. The going to prayer five times a day, the very insistence on the remembrance of God, is the best of all means of uplifting man from a low plain of life high up to the moral and spiritual realms and reconciling him, ultimately, to his God.

"It occupies," says Bosworth Smith, "in Islam a more prominent place both theoretically and practically than it does in any other religion."

There is nothing impracticable, irrational, or mortalizing in his precepts. They are best fitted and suited to all times. Piety, honesty, true devotion to God, and a brotherly feeling and love for all human beings were the breath of life to him.

As to the spiritualism, inculcated in Islam Sir William Muir writes, "Never, since the days when primitive Christianity startled the world from its sleep and waged a moral conflict with heathenism, had men seen the like awakening of spiritual life—the like faith that suffered sacrifices, and took joyfully the spoiling of goods for conscience' sake."

No religion in the world professes or teaches precepts which may be more moral, practicable, and rational than those of Islam.

"Islam," to quote Professor Montet, "is a religion that is essentially rationalistic in the widest sense of this term considered etymologically and historically. The definition of rationalism as a system that bases religious beliefs on principles furnished by the reason applies to it exactly. It is true that Muhammad, who was an enthusiast and possessed, too, the ardour of faith and the fire of conviction, that precious quality he transmitted to so many of his disciples,—brought forward his reform as a revelation: but this kind of revelation is only one form of exposition, and his religion has all the marks of a collection of doctrines founded on the data of reason. To believers, the Muhammadan creed is summed up in belief in the unity of God and in the

mission of His Prophet, and to ourselves who coldly analyse his doctrines, to belief in God and a future life; these two dogmas, the minimum of religious belief, statements that to the religious men rest on the firm basis of reason, sum up the whole doctrinal teaching of the Quran. The simplicity and clearness of this teaching are certainly among the most obvious forces at work in the religion and the missionary activity of Islam. But inspite of the rich development, in every sense of the term, of the teachings of the Prophet, the Quran has invariably kept its place as the fundamental starting point, and the dogma of the unity of God has always been proclaimed therein with a grandeur, a majesty, an invariable purity, and with a note of sure conviction, which it is hard to find surpassed outside the pale of Islam. A creed so precise, so stripped of all theological complexities and consequently so accessible to the ordinary understanding, might be expected to possess and does indeed possess a marvellous power of winning its way into the consciences of men."

"It is," says Davenport, "a religion, moreover, stripped of all controversy, and which, proposing no mystery to offer violence to reason, restricts the imagination of man to the being satisfied with a plain, invariable worship, ... and which bears intense proof of having been the result of long, deep meditation on the nature of the things, upon the state and condition of the nations of the world at that time, and the reconcilment of the objects of religion with those of reason."

"Again," says Bosworth Smith, "Mohammedanism is in the true sense of the word a spiritual religion."

Polygamy, which he never instituted, but permitted as lawful after some very important modifications, has been one of the charges, brought against him by Christian writers and antagonists of Islam.

But it is out of mere fanaticism and a lack of real insight into human nature. Had they meditated on the natural desires and weaknesses of man, they could never have done so.

I say and can prove that polygamy with the regulations of Muhammad is quite natural, indispensable in some cases, and therefore necessary to maintain morality and to preserve the society from the blames of foulness and unchastity. I will now briefly explain it here.

All desires and passions, that human beings are naturally subject to, are inborn in mankind with variance, greater and stronger in some, lesser and weaker in others. All are born with different tendencies and weaknesses, which are found in varying degrees in different individuals.

For instance, take the most common example, the hunger. Is this desire equal in all human beings? Can all of them be satisfied with equal quantities of food—say one loaf? The fact is that while a majority is satisfied with one, there is a minority which is never satisfied with one and urges for two, three, or even four.

Then whom will you call wise, one who allows you, after certain important conditions to maintain morality and to preserve the society from the blames of foulness and immorality, the privilege of satisfying your desire to your heart's content with one, two, three, or four loaves. or one. who enjoins on you on fear of

rigorous punishment, to take, without any regard to the difference of your desires, and without any distinction of physical superiority, only one and not more? And what would the result be if the latter condition were enforced? Certainly the natural result would be that those who possess greater desires than others, would, on account of their natural weakness to resist the inborn desires and passions, be obliged to resort to illegitimate and unlawful means for the pacification of their desires; and disorder and immorality would be the natural result.

As with hunger so with other natural desires and passions of man. Just as all men—weak and strong, fat or lean, cannot be satisfied with one measure of food, so can they all not be equally satisfied with one wife.

Therefore, the law of Islam says that a man can marry one, two, three, or even four wives, but not more, and that he should marry only one if he cannot deal with them with equity not only in matters of clothing and lodgement, but also love and esteem. (For other explanations see Syed Ameer Ali's "Spirit of Islam")

After such regulations and restrictions, Islam permits polygamy as a natural provision for the lawful gratification of human desires and with a view to guard humanity against foulness and unchastity.

To judge by results, the countries where polygamy is legally permitted are much better from a moral point of *view*, than those where it is dis-allowed and so, as an ultimate and natural result, practised under certain other names.

From a moral point of *view* which is better

France or Arabia, England or Afghanistan? The reader may answer for himself.

As to the unparalleled success, which Islam has gained as a proselytizing creed, Cannon Issac Taylor says, 'It is not the first propagation of Islam that has to be explained, but it is the permanency with which it retains its hold upon its converts. Christianity is less tenacious in its grasp. An African tribe, once converted to Islam, never reverts to paganism and never embraces Christianity Islam has done more for civilization than Christianity. Take for example, the statements of English officials or lay teachers as to the practical results of Islam. When Mohammedanism is embraced by a negro tribe, paganism, devil-worship, fetichism, cannibalism, human sacrifices, infanticide, witch-craft, at once disappear. The natives begin to dress, filth is replaced by cleanliness, and they acquire personal dignity and self-respect. Hospitality becomes a religious duty, drunkenness becomes rare, gambling is forbidden, immodest dances and promiscuous intercourse of the sexes ceases. Female chastity is regarded as a virtue, industry replaces idleness. . . . law, order, and sobriety prevail, blood-feuds, cruelty to animals and to slaves are forbidden. A feeling of humanity, benevolence, and brotherhood is inculcated, polygamy and slavery are regulated, their evils restrained. Islam, above all, is the most powerful total abstinence association in the world, whereas the extension of European trade means the extension of drunkenness, vice and the degradation of the people. Islam introduces a civilization of no low order, including a knowledge of reading and writing, decent clothing, personal cleanliness, veracity and self-respect. Its restraining and civilizing effects are marvellous. How little have we to show for the vast sums and all the precious lives lavished upon Africa! Christian

converts are reckoned by thousands, Moslem converts by millions. 'These are the stern facts we have to face; it is a pity to ignore them.'

The book, he gave to the world, is the most perfect and thorough in all respects. "It is a religious, social, civil, commercial, military, judicial and penal code, for it regulates 'everything from the ceremonies of religion to those of daily life, from the salvation of the soul to the health of the body, from collective to individual rights, from morality to crime, from earthly punishments to hell hereafter.'"

As to the sanctity of the Holy Koran, the success, it has gained in producing a good effect, and the esteem with which it is regarded by the believers, I cannot resist the temptation to quote the beautiful assertion of Major Leonard.

"As God's word," he writes, "there is a sanctity in the Koran, for every Moslem, that exceeds the reverence of the Christian for the Bible, as much as the fiery splendour of the sun surpasses the cold pale glamour of the moon, which is but a pale reflection of the substance and reality. . . . All the same if a book is to be gauged by its net results, by the effects it produced on all that is deepest and best in human nature, then the Koran must necessarily take high rank as one of the world's greatest work."

As to the Koran and its being a permanent miracle, the following remark of Bosworth Smith is worth quoting here.

"By a fortune," says he, "absolutely unique in history, Mohammed is a threefold founder—'of a nation, of an empire, and of a religion.' Illiterate himself, scarcely able to read and write, he was yet

the author of a book which is a poem, a code of laws, a Book of Common Prayer and a Bible in one, and is revered to this day by a sixth of the whole human race as a miracle of purity of style, of wisdom and of truth. It was the one miracle claimed by Mohammed,—his ‘standing miracle’ he called it; and a miracle indeed it is.”

The style of the holy Koran is the most excellent and beautiful. Even George Sale, a severe critic, could not but acknowledge this fact. The reader may form an opinion of the value of his Preliminary Discourse, which he prefixes to his translation of the holy Koran, by bearing in mind that he denounces Muhammad as an illiterate impostor and calls him a mad man, and then perusing the following assertion of his.

“It,” he says, “is confessedly the standard of Arabic tongue and as the more orthodox believe, and are taught by the book itself, inimitable by any human pen, and therefore insisted on as a permanent miracle, greater than that of raising the dead, and alone sufficient to convince the world of its divine original.

And to this miracle did Mohammed chiefly appeal for the confirmation of his mission, publicly challenging the most eloquent men in Arabia, which was at that time stocked with thousands whose sole study and ambition it was to excel in elegance of style and composition, to produce even a single chapter that might be compared with it.

I will mention but one instance out of several to show that this book was really admired for the beauty of its composure by those who may be allowed to have been competent judges. A poem of Labid-Ebn-Rabia’ one of the greatest wits in Arabia

in Mohammed's time, being fixed upon the gate of the temple of Mecca, an honour allowed to none but the most esteemed performances, none of the other poets durst offer anything of their own in competition with it.

But the second chapter of the Koran being fixed up by it soon after, Labid himself (then an idolator) onraedjing the first verses only, was struck with admiration and immediately professed the religion taught thereby declaring that such words could proceed from an inspired person only.

The style of the Koran is generally beautiful and fluent, especially where it imitates the prophetic manner and Scripture phrases. It is concise . . . adorned with bold figures after the Eastern taste, enlivened with florid and sententious expressions and in many places, especially where the majesty and attributes of God are described, sublime and magnificent; of which the reader cannot but observe several instances, though he must not imagine the translation comes up to the original, notwithstanding my endeavours to do it justice."

May I now ask all those, who still doubt in the prophetic mission of Muhammad, whether such a book, inimitable and untranslatable as Sale himself affirms, and which, in spite of their animosity, has won so much admiration from writers like Sale, can be the work of an illiterate man. If so, can you produce any other example like it?

The Divine original of the Holy Korau can be deduced from the assertion of George Sale himself. On the one hand, he affirms that the Koran is the standard of the Arabic tongue, and on the other, he acknowledges Muhammad to have been an illiterate man.

Now, no illiterate man has ever written a book, which could be the standard of any tongue for any time whatsoever; but Muhammad was illiterate, and the Koran has been, for thirteen centuries, the standard of Arabic, one of the most difficult classical languages of the world; and inasmuch as it is preserved pure not only on pieces of paper or stone, but in the innermost shrines of the human heart, where none can temper with it, we can safely presume that it will remain so for ever.

This fact alone is enough to prove that the Holy Koran is not the work of a human brain and that it is a Divine Revelation. No human brain could ever compose a book which could be the standard of any tongue for ever.

Muhammad had had the sagacity and foresight to give instructions to preserve the purity of his book,—instructions which have been carried most carefully to this day. hundreds and thousands of men committing it to memory word by word—nay letter by letter.

So today while all other revelations, known as Divine, have become corrupted, his book remains just as it was delivered from his lips.

“In the Koran,” says Bosworth Smith, “we have, beyond all reasonable doubt, the exact words of Mohammed without subtraction and without addition.”

He did not touch the extremes, but guided his followers on the right path of peace, moderation and rationality. He did not give out any thing mysterious like the trinity or incarnation, which human mind could not grasp. He preached pure Monotheism, to prove which he went direct

to the phenomena of nature and appealed not to the credulity but the reason of man.

"The mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation," says Gibbon, "appear to contradict the principle of the Divine Unity. In their obvious sense they introduce three equal deities, and transform the man Jesus into the substance of the son God; an orthodox commentary will satisfy only a believing mind. . . . The creed of Mahomet is free from the suspicion of ambiguity, and the Koran is a glorious testimony to the Unity of God."

Speaking of Christianity and Islam, Davenport says, "It must be borne in mind that whereas the hold, the former has over its professors, is naturally referred by them to its dogmas, thus causing religion and morals to be distinct from each other; in the latter it is on the contrary, not the dogmatic, but the practical portion has influenced the moral, social, legal and political ideas and circumstances of its believers. So that, to the Mohammaden mind, patriotism, legality, tradition, constitution, right, are all included in that one word—Islam. . . . the religion thus established by the Quran is stern and severe Monotheism: it has nothing abstract and indistinct in its primary notion of Godhead."

Speaking of the causes that led to the success of Islam, T. W. Arnold says, "Foremost among these is the simplicity of the Muslim creed, there is no god but God, and Muhammad is the Apostle of God. . . . This simple creed demands no great trial of faith, arouses as a rule no particular intellectual difficulties and is within the compass of the meanest intelligence."

The following quotation from the Holy Koran will give the reader an idea of what Muhammad's God is.

"He is God, beside Whom there is no other God, the Knower of what is hidden and revealed He is the Loving, the Kind. He is God, beside Whom, there is no other God, the King, the Holy, the Saviour, the Faithful, the Guardian, the Glorious, the Powerful, the Self-magnifying. Far is He above what they join with Him! He is God, the Creator, the Producer, the Fashioner. His are beautiful Names, whatsoever is in the heavens and the earth praiseth Him, and He is the Mighty, the Wise."

He preached that salvation can be obtained only by virtuous living and free mercy of God.

"The belief that man will be judged," writes the author of *Ten Great Religions*, "by his work solely, throws the Moslem on the practice of self-denial and universal charity; the belief in Divine Providence, in the mercy, love, and omnipotence of God, leads him to self-humiliation before the Almighty, and the practice of those heroic virtues which have given rise to the charge that the virtues of Islam are stoical."

He strictly adhered to the noble adage—"Example is better than precept." There is no precept of his but he himself practised it rigidly and in the most accomplished manner.

This is one of the many respects in which he claims superiority over all other prophets.

He was, moreover, a prophet not only for his own, but all ages and nations. He succeeded in founding and organising a brotherhood the like

of which is not to be found in the history of the world. He united all humanity into one integrate unit, with the belief in one God as its focus and centre.

As a civilizing agent, Islam has performed the most notable achievements.

"We cannot consider in this place," says Chamber's Encyclopædia, "what Islam has done for the cause of all humanity, or, more exactly what is its precise share in the development of science and art in Europe. Broadly speaking, the Mohammedans may be said to have been the enlightened teachers of barbarous Europe, from the ninth to the thirteenth century. . . . Arabic, Philosophy, Medicine, Natural History, Geography, History, Grammar, Rhetoric, and the 'golden art of poetry,' schooled by the old Hellenic masters, brought forth an abundant harvest of works, many of which will live and teach as long as there are generations to be taught."

The Koran is, to use the words of Deutsch, "a book by the aid of which the Arabs conquered a world greater than that of Alexander the great, greater than that of Rome, and in as many tens of years as the latter had wanted hundreds to accomplish her conquests: by the aid of which they alone of all the Semites came to Europe as kings, whither the Phœnicians had come as tradesmen, and the Jews as fugitives or captives; came to Europe to hold up, together with these fugitives, the light to humanity;—they alone, while darkness lay around, to raise up the wisdom and knowledge of Hellas from the dead, to teach philosophy, medicine, astronomy, and the golden art of song to the West as to the East, to stand at the cradle of modern science,

and to cause us late epigoni for ever to weep over the day when Grenada fell."

Speaking of the Holy Koran, Johnson says, "If it is not poetry,—and it is hard to say whether it be or not,—it is more than poetry. It is not history, nor biography. It is not anthology, like the Sermon on the Mount; nor metaphysical dialectics, like the Buddhist Sutras; nor sublime homiletics, like Plato's conferences of the wise and foolish teachers. It is a prophet's cry, Semitic to the core; yet of a meaning so universal and so timely that all the voices of the age take it up, willing or unwilling, and it echoes over palaces and deserts, over cities and empires, first kindling its chosen hearts to world-conquests, then gathering itself up into a reconstructive force that all the creative light of Greece and Asia might penetrate the heavy gloom of Christian Europe, when Christianity was but the Queen of Night."

To sum up, the superiority of Muhammad over all other prophets lies in the simplicity, practicability, rationality, and morality of his precepts, in his being an example rather than an ideal for all his followers, in all phases of life, and above all in the width and the success of his mission.

7.—WAS MUHAMMAD SUPERIOR TO ALL OTHER TRUTHFUL AND HONEST MEN?

Muhammad was, in fact, the truest man humanity has ever produced. As to his being honest, there can be not the least doubt; for, in spite of their animosity, he was called 'al-Amin', the honest and trustworthy even by his enemies from the very beginning of his life. He was always true and honest, and his life is the noblest record of

simplicity, sincerity, piety, and truth. "Mohammed's sincerity and fixity of purpose," says Leonard, "is a fact we cannot get away from. . . . In reality Mohammed was an ultra great man. The difference between other great men and himself was wide."

Although a king and a ruler in his later years, he was never in the least luxurious or pleasure-loving. "His life," says Smith, "was simple in all its details."

The mode of his life and the manner of his living were the simplest possible, his meals often frugal and meagre, and his abode very simple and without any furniture or any other decoration.

"The good sense of Mahomet," writes Gibbon, "despised the pomp of royalty; the apostle of God submitted to the menial offices of the family: he kindled the fire, swept the floor, milked the ewes and mended with his own hands his shoes and woollen garments. Disdaining the penance and merit of an hermit, he observed, without effort or vanity, the abstemious diet of an Arab and soldier. On solemn occasions he feasted his companions with rustic plenty; but, in his domestic life, many weeks would elapse without a fire being kindled on the hearth of the Prophet."

In spite of his countless duties, he was ever exact and punctual in all of them,—duties temporal, religious and otherwise.

Stanley Lane-poole has described his character and temperament in beautiful terms. "There is," he says, "something so tender and womanly, and yet so heroic, about the man, that one is in peril of finding the judgement unconsciously blinded by the feeling of reverence and well-nigh love that such

a nature inspires. He who, standing alone braved for years the hatred of his people, is the same who was never the first to withdraw his hand from another's clasp; the beloved of children, who never passed a group of little ones without a smile from his wonderful eyes and a kind word for them, sounding all the kinder in that sweet-toned voice. The frank friendship, the noble generosity, the dauntless courage and hope of the man, all tend to melt criticism into admiration.

He was an enthusiast in that noblest sense when enthusiasm becomes the salt of the earth, the one thing that keeps men from rotting whilst they live. Enthusiasm is often used spitefully, because it is joined to an unworthy cause, or falls upon barren ground and bears no fruit. So was it not Mohammed. He was an enthusiast when enthusiasm was the one thing needed to set the world aflame, and his enthusiasm was noble for a noble cause. He was one of those happy few who have attained the supreme joy of making one great truth their very life-spring. He was the messenger of the one God; and never to his life's end did he forget who he was, or the message which was the marrow of his being. He brought his tidings to his people with a grand dignity sprung from the consciousness of his high office, together with a most sweet humility, whose roots lay in the knowledge of his own weakness."

In a word, his life is a clean, spotless and stainless sheet of piety, purity, holiness and truth.

Apart from all I have said till now, there is one more respect in which Mohammed claims superiority over all other men.

Like many of those, entitled as "the great," he was not a fabulous hero, who reigned in the realms

of fiction, nor one whose whole life remains obscure in mystery. He was an historical personage, living, working, and acting among his fellow beings and in this wonderful world of ours,—a personage the minutest details of whose life have been recorded and preserved to this day. “He is,” to quote Syed Ameer Ali, “the grandest figure upon whom the light of history has ever shone.”

He was, in fact, as Gilman has remarked, “the only man mentioned in history who was at once legislator and poet; the founder of a religion and of an empire.”

No biography upto this advanced time of the world has been recorded so minutely, so thoroughly, and so perfectly as that of Muhammad.

Moreover, when biographies of men of great renown have been written, only one aspect of their life has been taken into account,—the aspect which gained for them the title or renown; for example, from the biographies of kings, only their life and character as a king can be made out, while other sides to their life remain almost obscure. But with Muhammad the case is not so.

“But,” says Bosworth Smith, “we know everything of the external history of Mohammed—his youth, his appearance, his relations, his habits; the first idea and the gradual growth, intermittent though it was, of his great revelation; while for his internal history, after his mission had been proclaimed, we have a book absolutely unique in its origin, in its preservation, ... but on the substantial authenticity of which no one has ever been able to cast a serious doubt.”

From his biography we can learn not only how he ruled, gave religious sermons, conducted prayers,

offered sacrifices and commanded his men: but also how he sat, how he stood, how he walked and how he talked, how he slept and how he arose, where he lived and how he lived, what he did and when and where he did, what, where and when he said, how he behaved with friends and foes, at home and abroad, with neighbour and country-man, in short all he did and said.

Although at one and the same time he had to perform the combined offices of a prophet, a king, a ruler, and a reformer *i.e.* in short a material and spiritual builder, and all the duties and functions of a father, a husband, a leader, and a guide, Muhammad was ever and always faithful and punctual to the highest degree.

He fulfilled his duties in such a miraculously accomplished manner that even his vile critics could not but acknowledge his sincerity. No man could ever perform even a single duty with so much punctuality and uniformity as he did.

He is a perfect and living example for all his followers, following any course or occupation of life, and in all states of manhood.

Major Leonard describes his character in the following terms.

“Stern and rigid to a degree where God and the Faith was concerned; where men, but especially women and children, were concerned, he was all tenderness and pity.

Dutiful and obedient to his uncle who had been a father to him, he was a faithful servant, an exemplary husband, a kind father, a good master. The very name of Faithful, by which he was always distinguished, proves beyond a doubt what manner

of man he was. An orphan himself in childhood, early inured to poverty, his heart went out to all those who had the misfortune to be similarly situated. For the poor, the weak, the helpless, he had a fellow-feeling. The degraded or at least dependent and unprotected position of women, their moral and legal helplessness most of all, appealed to him. But in no sense because he was sensual."

Children and grown-up persons, husbands and fathers, priests and laymen, kings and soldiers, philosophers and administrators, rulers and the ruled, masters and servants, all find him their perfect guide; for there is no aspect of life but he led, and no honourable occupation but he followed.

Besides this, there is another thing which goes still farther to prove his superiority over all other men humanity has ever produced.

The greater the man is, the more is he remembered, commemorated and imitated by the people of the world. No man in the world is remembered so very often or imitated so frequently as Muhammad is.

Besides the mention of him and his name in his countless biographies written in all ages after him, in almost all languages of the world, by men of various nations, colours and countries, and his mention in the myriads of various other books on Islam and the Holy Koran, he is remembered at least more than fifty times and imitated at least five times a day, during the prayers, by an overwhelming majority of his followers who exceed, in number, 400,000,000 or nearly one-fourth of the whole human race, and who include men of all races, colours and countries.

He has left the greatest mark on the history

of the world.

So to conclude, Muhammad satisfies all our conditions and answers our questions fully and favourably. We have seen that he is superior to all other kings, conquerors, legislators, administrators, statesmen, politicians, thinkers, philosophers, reformers, nation-builders, saints, sages, prophets, true and honest persons, in short, all other material and spiritual builders. Hence he is the Greatest Man Humanity Has Ever Produced.

Thus, in my own imperfect way, have I touched so wide a subject very lightly; the reasons of brevity being not the want of arguments, but the desire to show how few words suffice to prove the superiority of the Arabian Prophet over all other men.

The task would, indeed, have been too difficult for me, had I not been assisted by the various authors, whom I have quoted.



APPENDIX.

It is fortunate enough for the followers of the Arabian Prophet that the task of refuting the charges, brought against him, has been done by his enemies themselves. What only remains for us is to collect them all in one volume.

Truth must, sooner or later, manifest itself and be distinguished from falsehood. A blind man may deceive a blind man, but he cannot deceive a man, who possesses two bright eyes.

"Minds may doubt and hearts may fail," says Dr. Illingworth, "when called to face new modes of thought or points of view; but the time must come when what is false in all things will fade and what is true will no more seem strange."

Sale, Muir, Sprenger and others may deceive persons like themselves; but an honest man having an impartial view and an unblinded judgement cannot but observe their partiality and prejudice.

It is curious to observe that their own views have been sometimes self-contradictory and sometimes contradictory to one another.

Sale's views contradict those of Muir, Muir's those of Sprenger; and Smith criticizes Muir, Sprenger and others. For example, see Bosworth Smith's *Mohammed and Mohammedanism*, pp. 18, note, 64, to, 68, 93, 98, 115, 121, 122, 126, 129, etc.

In fairness, I must acknowledge one thing. The more the English people and the western nations are coming into contact with Islam—real and orthodox Islam, the more their doubts are being removed, and

the more are they beginning to appreciate the congenial virtues of the preacher of Islam and the goodness and rationality of its precepts.

The strange and horrible notions* about Muhammad, his religion and his God, which many a holy father and catholic preacher had, in his fanaticism, spread about, are now being refuted and disregarded; and as we approach from an ancient to a modern writer, a change, of course for the better, is almost evident and discernable.

If we compare the remarks of Sale with those of Gibbon, of Muir with those of Sprenger and Osborn, and of these with those of Carlyle, Smith, Leonard, Arnold and other modern writers, we cannot but observe the vast difference, which we cannot term better than 'contrast'. But there is no comparison whatsoever between the remarks of the Catholic preachers of yore and the modern writers of today.

Put together the two remarks—one of Genebrard, a controversial writer, who says, "Mohammed was a beast," and the other of Bosworth Smith who says, "Compare Mohammed with the long roll of men whom the world by common consent has called 'Great;' take him all in all, what he was, and what he did, and what those inspired by him have done, he seems to me to stand alone, above and beyond them all. he comes next to Him, . . ."

Is there any comparison between these two?

The change now taking place in the West is on the whole encouraging. Truth and light have begun to manifest themselves; and it is to be hoped by the grace of God that when the few remaining

*For an interesting account of these, see Bosworth Smith's '*Mohammed And Mohammedanism*' *Lec.II*

misunderstandings have, like the many already done away with, been removed, Christianity shall, one day, give way to Islam—the only real and catholic religion of the world.

I am not dreaming, like Muir and Sale, of bright visions of a heavenly kingdom; nor am I cursing Christianity as they have done Islam, never can I do this so long as I am a Muslim; I am wide awake and dealing with facts and facts only.

The recent conversion of hundreds of Christian ladies and gentlemen to the holy faith of Islam in England, America and elsewhere, testifies and confirms my statement and views.

Note to Question III.

In my treatment of Christ (peace be on him) on pp. 16 and 17, I have dealt with him not as he really was, but as he is represented by the modern Christianity; and hence the contrast I have made.

I regret even to have been obliged to do so.

A CALL TO TRUTH.

Gentle Reader,

In speaking to you of the Arabian Prophet, I have laid down before you some of his precepts. Will you give me at this time an opportunity of doing one of my duties as a Muslim—the duty of calling you to '*Sirat-e-Mustaqim*,' the right path?

Will you, therefore, pause awhile and meditate upon what I have said? Will you reflect awhile on the simple and rational teachings of Islam? Will you try to understand what they mean and what they teach?

You may perhaps say that you know Islam already and that you need not bother about it again. But, my friend, I am afraid you may be wrong. You may be knowing Mussalmans, but not Islam. The following remark of Smith will confirm my opinion.

He says, "Yet, probably, nowhere is there a more profound ignorance of Islam and its founder, and a greater indifference to what it is doing in the world, than in England. Popular preachers and teachers still call the prophet of Arabia an impostor; and military officers, and even civil servants of the Crown have gone out to India, passed years there, and returned again, still fancying that Mussalmans are idolators."

The case is still worse with the Indian non-Muslims. Few, if any, of them know what Islam is and what it teaches.

Therefore, gentle reader, if you have not made

a study of Islam, do it today. But for this, pray, do not go to average Mussalmans, go to the Koran, its source and the Prophet, its preacher and expounder.

Study and then see whether it is more moral, more elevating, and more rational than other religions. See whether you find in it more truth than you do in other religions. If so, be convinced and then believe and profess.

Islam gives you truth, nothing but truth—the Unity of God, the source of all reality and existence.

Islam proposes no mystery to you, no trinity, no incarnation. It gives you truth in its simplest and purest form—"There is no god but God, and Muhammad is His Apostle." The former part is a self-evident truth which requires no explanation, and the latter is a deduction from the theorem. One who preached the unity of God and delivered His message to us must be His Apostle and Messenger.

Islam, moreover, appeals not to your credulity, but to your reason. This is one great difference between Christianity and Islam. The former asks you to believe in mysteries without understanding, knowing or disputing what they are; but the latter requests you to consider, meditate, understand, be convinced and then believe. Islam directs its followers on the path of Reason, Light, Security and Truth, while Christianity leaves them wandering in mysteries, enjoining, "These are mysteries, you cannot understand them, believe as your forefathers have done."

"In the Moslem religion," says Mr. Baden Powell, "there is nothing difficult to believe, in the Christian faith there are many and deep mysteries."

Therefore, noble reader, why go to mysteries, when reason can guide you? Why not believe in

truth in its purest form? Why not understand and then believe rather than believe and be doubtful?

The cardinal belief of the Islamic faith is, as I have said, "There is no god but God, and Muhammad is His Apostle and Prophet." Whoever believes in this at heart and professes it in words is a Muslim and our brother.

Now, I believe it is enough and should be closed with a prayer to the Almighty to give you wisdom and courage to follow the right path. Amin.

ERRATA

Page 19 line 9 for Muhammad *read* Mahomet—

„ 19	„ 17	„	preciou	„	precious.
„ 21	„ 9	„	effecteve	„	effective.
„ 21	„ 16	„	essencial	„	essential.
„ 23	„ 9	„	anb	„	and.
„ 23	„ 29	„	to use the use	„	to use.
„ 24	„ 34	„	aud	„	and.
„ 24	„ 34	„	Muhammad	„	Mohammed.
„ 25	„ 3	„	Qu.5 reforms	„	reforms.
„ 28	„ 15	„	Justice	„	Injustice.
„ 28	„ 25	„	reformations	„	reformation.
„ 28	„ 15	„	calumyn	„	calumny.
„ 31	„ 26	„	Muhammad	„	Mohammed.
„ 31	„ 29	„	„	„	„
„ 33	„ 9	„	„	„	„
„ 33	„ 12	„	ameliorations	„	amelioration.
„ 33	„ 18	„	parached	„	preached.
„ 34	„ 6	„	Ptief	„	Piety.
„ 49	„ 24	„	smith	„	Smith.
„ 26	„ 31	„	centuary	„	century.
„ 12	„ last,	„	after sword,	„	add ;Mohammed seized it.
„ 39	„ 22	„	before pale	„	insert, a shadow.

Printed at the Anjuman Press, NAGPUR.
And published by the author.

